DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 318 HE 013 826

AUTHOR Millard, Richard M.
TITLE Statewide Coordination and Governance of Postsecondary Education: Quality, Costs and Accountability: The Major Issues of the 1980s.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO IEP-047
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education (Wayzata, MN, December 1977).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Budgeting; *Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; Educational History; Educational Quality; *Governance; Higher Education; *Postsecondary Education; Program Evaluation; *State Boards of Education; State Standards; *Statewide Planning; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

The historical development of coordinating and governing boards in higher education, the structures and powers of these boards, concerns common to the different states, and current issues are considered. The major period of acceleration in the development of state higher education agencies and boards occurred during 1960 to 1975, the most rapid period of expansion in higher education. While all types of institutions increased in size, by far the major growth was in state institutions. Planning, program review or approval, and budget development are three major areas in which most boards have some responsibility. However, boards vary from state to state both in their powers for carrying out these functions and in the scope of their applicability. Factors contributing to the formation of the coordinating or governing boards include: increased expenditures, providing budgetary equity among institutions, assuring diversity among state institutions, and avoiding unnecessary duplication. Additional concerns include projected enrollments concerning traditional and nontraditional college students; funding difficulties in higher education; the increased demand for accountability; growing concern for private, proprietary, and vocational institutions; the impact of collective bargaining; and the impact of federal legislation and regulation. Mandates for the future are also addressed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Inservice Education Program (IEP)

ED2023318

Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

STATEWIDE COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION: QUALITY, COSTS
AND ACCOUNTABILITY -- THE MAJOR ISSUES OF THE 1980s

RICHARD M. MILLARD

Director, Postsecondary Education Department
Education Commission of the States

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Spring Hill Center, Wayzata, Minnesota
December 1977

IEP Paper No. 047

HE013 826

Education Commission of the States

Inservice Education Program (IEP)
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

SHEEO

The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers

STATEWIDE COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION: QUALITY, COSTS
AND ACCOUNTABILITY -- THE MAJOR ISSUES OF THE 1980s

Coordinating boards are not a new phenomenon. The first one was established by the first regular session of the New York legislature in 1784 as "the regents of the University of the State of New York" to serve as the trustees or governing board for the reconstituted King's College as Columbia University, but it was also empowered to serve as trustees for "such schools or colleges as might be established in any other part of the state."[1] The law was revised in 1787 giving Columbia its own board of trustees but giving supervisory power to the regents for academies, schools and colleges "to enable them to mold the several institutions into a unity that would serve the best interests of the people of the state as a whole."[2] Thus the first state educational board in the country was a higher education board -- a consolidated governing board for a short period and then for almost two centuries a coordinating board. From the beginning the regents had the explicit responsibility and power to make plans and policies for higher education without regard to distinctions in public and private control. As an historical footnote, the regents did not become responsible for elementary/secondary education until the 20th century.

Before the end of the 19th century four states had established consolidated governing boards for their public institutions and Florida had developed its unique Board of Education consisting of the governor and his cabinet which still has the responsibility for coordinating all levels of education

---

[1]Frank Abbott, Government Policy and Higher Education, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1938, p. 14.

[2]Ibid.

in the state. By the end of World War II, 17 states had established central higher education agencies. The 14 of these states with consolidated governing boards recognized early, as Robert Berdahl has pointed out,[3] that in periods of expansion the assumption that individual institutional lay boards would protect the public interest is only partially true because of the legitimate ambitions of such boards for their own institutions. Essentially these states decided to control premature expansion and proliferation and financial commitments going beyond the states' resources or needs. The Georgia consolidated governing board established during the depression (1931) actually eliminated 10 institutions.

The real pressures for statewide coordination began in the 50s and accelerated in the 60s and early-70s. Six more coordinating boards, three of whom later changed to consolidated governing boards (North Carolina, Wisconsin and Utah) appeared during the 50s. The 50s were also the period of the flowering of voluntary coordinating arrangements. Such voluntary coordination, however, had two major weaknesses. First, since the success of such arrangements depended entirely on the willingness of the presidents and institutions to cooperate, they tended to be viable only so long as the institutions were not of a competing nature. Second, when voluntary coordination did work, as Lyman Glenny has pointed out,[4] it tended to preserve the status quo and be dominated by the major or largest institutions. As other institutions grew stronger they tended to challenge the dominant institutions and the need for more formal coordination and regulation became evident. During the 60s and early-70s all of these voluntary structures for statewide coordination disappeared.

---

[3]Robert O. Berdahl, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971, p. 27.

[4]Lyman Glenny, "Politics and Current Problems in Coordinating Higher Education", and John Minter, ed., Campus and Capital. Boulder, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966, p. 38.

It is no accident that the major period of acceleration in the development of state higher education agencies and boards occurred during the most rapid period of expansion of higher education in the history of the country -- 1960 to 1975. While all types of institutions increased in size by far the major growth was in public institutions. In 1950 about half the students in the country were in private institutions. Today only 21 percent of the students are in private institutions. Total higher education enrollments in 1960 were about 3.7 million students. In the fall of 1976 enrollments had reached 11.2 million. Total higher education expenditures in 1960 amounted to $5.6 million. Today they approximate $40 billion. A relatively small segment of higher education in 1960 -- community and junior colleges -- now account for approximately one-third of all students. The major responsibility for meeting this phenomenal demand has rested with the states. With such major expansion it was not at all surprising that governors and state legislatures created state coordinating and governing boards to deal with the problems of expansion. In fact, in most of the state laws establishing such agencies during this period the stated purpose was "to provide for the orderly growth of public higher education in the state."

Thus between 1960 and 1975, 24 new boards were established. In contrast to pre-1960, most of the boards established since 1960 have been coordinating rather than governing boards. The two exceptions are West Virginia and Maine plus the changes noted in North Carolina, Wisconsin and Utah from coordinating to governing boards. Today, if one includes the two states with executively appointed planning agencies only, all 50 states have some form of state higher or postsecondary board and agency. Nineteen of these are consolidated governing boards, 11 of which include all public

higher educational institutions and eight of which include only senior public institutions. Twenty nine are coordinating agenices. Two are executively appointed planning commissions only.

The structures, functions and powers of these boards vary considerably from state to state. In fact there are no two that are exactly alike. They vary in the number of institutions under their purview and their responsibilities in relation to them. Even among governing board states some boards govern most or all public postsecondary institutions and some senior or four-year institutions only. In most governing board states, governance is wholly centralized; however, in two states (North Carolina and Utah) governance is to some extent decentralized through institutional boards of trustees or institutional councils with restricted but delegated powers from the central board.

Coordinating boards vary even more widely than governing boards. They range from states like Oklahoma where the State Regents submit a consolidated budget and appropriations are made to the regents who allocate funds among institutions, review and approve all programs and are responsible for planning for all postsecondary education, to states like Wyoming where the Higher Education Council has no program review or budgetary function and is primarily a legislatively authorized planning and advisory agency. Roughly some 17 states fall into the group that Robert Berdahl would call strong or regulatory coordinating boards in that according to their authorizing legislation they have the power to approve programs and submit consolidated or aggregated budgets to the governor and legislature. In addition, there are two states in which the board approves programs but has no statutory role in the budgeting process and one state with program

approval that sets formulas rather than budgets. In two other states the boards submit an aggregated or consolidated budget and review but do not have approval power over programs. This leaves eight states where the board is technically an advisory board only charged with giving advice both to institutions and state government. But among these eight are three states where in practice the board's advice on programs is tantamount to approval. Just to complicate the picture further in eight of the states the board or agency responsible for postsecondary education is also responsible for elementary/secondary education and in four of these the same person is the chief state school officer and the state higher education executive officer. In six states the board or its executive officer has cabinet status.

To summarize, in relation to the three major areas in which most boards have some responsibility either prescribed by law or developed by policy -- planning, program review or approval and budget development -- boards vary from state to state both in the powers they have for carrying out these functions and in the scope of their applicability. In fact, both power and applicability vary in regard to each of the functions in question. For example, a board may have major responsibilities in the budgetary process, including recommending a consolidated budget, and only advisory responsibilities in program approval. A board, including a governing board, may have statutory responsibility for planning for senior public institutions only, or it may have statutory planning responsibility for the full range of postsecondary education, or, as a third alternative, it may have statutory responsibilities for planning in some areas but as a matter of policy extend its planning functions to other areas. Finally,

a statutorily based board may have executive rather than statutory responsibility for planning in relation to the full range of postsecondary education. In practice a board may be unable to exercise its full statutory responsibility in any one of the three central areas. On the other hand, a board with a relatively restricted statutory base may, through leadership and policy development, extend its influence considerably beyond what is prescribed by law. It must be added that many of the boards have functions in addition to the three major ones that range all the way from administering state student aid programs and various federal programs to chartering and authorizing institutions to operate.

There is another important historical and descriptive fact to keep in mind. To date, no state that has established a coordinating or consolidated governing board has abandoned it for a return to no coordination or voluntary coordination. While coordinating boards have been given up -- as in North Carolina, Wisconsin and Utah -- they have been replaced by consolidated governing boards. If there is a trend it has been toward increasing the role or power of such boards, including governing boards. Between 1970 and 1975, 23 states modified their state higher education agencies and with two possible exceptions the modifications were in the direction of strengthening them. In 1976 alone 17 states at least considered modifications primarily in the direction of strengthening board powers and functions. Today boards across the country are under scrutiny; one might almost say they are in trouble, but the trouble is not that they are too strong but that they are perceived as not having sufficient power to do what legislators and governors expect of them,

or if they have the power, they are not perceived as effectively and fully exercising it.

So where are we today? We are with 50 different boards across the country -- 53 to be exact, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands -- no two of which are exactly alike. They have been created in individual states to meet indigenous problems, many of which are analogous among groups of states or even across the states but which are not identical, and the forms they have taken, the powers they have been given relate to the different histories and the state of higher education and social conditions in these states. This is extraordinarily important to keep in mind in the discussions of the next two days for otherwise generalizations come easy and are likely to be either mistaken or seriously misleading.

The fact that 48 states have legislatively, and in some cases constitutionally, authorized coordinating or governing boards is rather strong evidence that they were created to meet real needs that were not or could not be met by institutions separately. Perhaps the fundamental need is best expressed in the 1787 New York legislation creating the Board of Regents -- that is, "to enable them to mold the several institutions into a unity that would serve the best interests of the people of the state as a whole."[5] The fact that other boards did not appear until toward the end of the 19th century and the major movement of states to create boards is a phenomenon of the last 25 years is an index of the increased importance of higher education as a public policy issue in the light of the number of people concerned and involved. When, as in 1900, only 4 percent of the 18 to 24

---

[5] Op. Cit.

year old population was in higher educational institutions, higher education was hardly a matter of major state or federal concern. Beginning with the returning veterans and continuing to today the situation is very different.

While specific factors that gave rise to such boards and the timing of their formation as well as the form they took varied from state to state, there were some relatively common concerns within the general concern of providing for orderly growth that contributed to their formation and to their functions. Among these were concern (1) with the increasing rates of expenditure and a desire to keep these expenditures in perspective and balance, (2) with budgetary equity among institutions in the light of their different functions, (3) with assuring reasonable diversity among institutions within the system of higher education to meet the variety of state needs, (4) to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs not related to demand in the expanding market, and (5) with balancing institutional operations with political and social realities as they relate to social and geographical distribution of opportunities. There was in addition in many states a legislative and gubernatorial desire not to have to deal with interinstitutional rivalries directly in executive chambers, in legislative committees and on the legislative floors but to find a means of ameliorating these beforehand. Admittedly, there was and still is more than a little legislative ambivalence on this particularly in relation to any institutions in a legislator's home district.

In the late-60s and early-70s additional concerns have become progressively prominent growing first out of student unrest and then out of the changing fiscal situation -- recession then depression. These have included

concern (1) with institutional management and efficiency, (2) with far more, and, more accurate, information as a basis for decision making, (3) with relevance of programs to student needs, (4) with accountability for use of public funds, and (5) with the relation of postsecondary educational programs to manpower needs and the world of work.

Given the charges and the concerns, how well have statewide coordinating and governing boards performed? Here the answer almost has to be: With varying degrees of success. I have no intention of offering a report card on the state agencies as the Carnegie Council attempted to offer on the states.[6] For me to do so would be highly presumptious. State agencies have made mistakes. Some have not involved institutions as fully as might be desired in the planning process. Usually when this has occurred the plan itself has gathered dust on the shelf. Some have found themselves or let themselves be caught between legislative and gubernatorial clashes or even in a few cases political conflicts within the state in which they could not win. Some have so identified themselves or been identified with their institutions as to lose credibility with the legislature or the governor. Others have been so identified with their legislature or governor as to lose even minimal institutional confidence and to encourage end runs. Some have not clearly distinguished the role of the board from that of the institutional or segmental governing boards and have moved into areas best left to institutions. Some, as noted, have disappeared and been replaced by stronger agencies.

On the other side of the ledger and recognizing as is obviously the case that other factors in addition to the existence and activities of statewide

---

[6]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976, chapter 3.

agencies contributed to the results, the very fact that states were able to respond to the onslaught of students, that as Clark Kerr has pointed out elsewhere[7] during the period of expansion while not every student necessarily got into the particular institution he wanted to, no student was turned away for lack of space, suggests that these boards have played a critically important role. It should be pointed out that during this period even the so-called "flagship" institutions could not have and had no intention of including all students. If anything, their concerns were with greater selectivity, developing research potential, and becoming "great institutions." This was not only understandable but in the best interests of a diversified system. Without the statewide concerns with diversification to meet needs -- development of community colleges, strengthening the role of teachers' colleges as state colleges or regional universities, creation of specialized institutions, concern with equity -- in other words without the balance statewide boards were established to try to facilitate, the picture might look far more chaotic and public distrust might be considerably greater than is the case today.

One of the lessons that has been rather clearly learned by most states in the process is that "representative" boards tend not to work very effectively. They have some of the same defects that the older voluntary coordinating arrangements did. While boards need as much advice as possible from presidents and institutional representatives, to include such representatives as voting members on boards either tends to logrolling or to inaction on any issue that involves conflict of the vested interests of institutions. While many of the boards started out with representative members, most states have either eliminated them or made certain that they

---

[7]Clark Kerr, The Changing Face of Higher Education, Southern Regional Education Board, 1973, p. 33.

do not constitute a majority. In only four states today do representative members constitute half or a majority of members.

Today the period of expansion is over. The issues that institutions and state higher education agencies are or will be facing are quite different from those of the third decade of the century, in fact to some extent they are reversed. The critical question becomes whether agencies and boards established to deal with problems of orderly growth can deal with the more difficult problems of an unsteady or decreasing state.

What are some of these issues? Most of them are familiar to you by this time. But it might be well worthwhile to review some of the more serious ones quickly.

The first is projected enrollments. There obviously are differences among states and differences among institutions. But some of the demographic facts are rather clear. Between 1980 and 1985 the traditional college age population will drop by 4.1 percent. In only about four states are modest increases in the age group expected. In some states the decrease between 1975 and 1985 will be closer to 25 percent. The number of high school graduates going on to college, particularly among males, has been dropping since 1968 and even the number of high school graduates in relation to total high school age population in the last few years has not increased. While demographic facts alone do not determine enrollments most of the less pessimistic enrollment projections count rather heavily on increased older and part-time students. If one includes both demographic and migration projections only six states are expected to have modest increases in traditional freshmen between now and 1985.[8]

---

[8]Cathy Henderson, Changes in Enrollment by 1985. Washington: American Council on Education, 1977. p. 16.

There may indeed be a good many older persons who would benefit from and welcome the opportunity for additional education, but even here the picture is not quite as clear as it is sometimes made out to be. Already the average college age is over the traditional college age figure. One out of every ten students is over 35. It just might be the case that many of the older students who want college courses and college credits are already there. In 1976 for the first time in 17 years college enrollments dropped 1.2 percent. Community colleges that enroll the largest percentage of older students and who had increased 50 percent since 1970, dropped 2.2 percent. Most surprisingly students over 35 who had increased 50 percent in the previous two years did not increase. There may be a good many older people who are interested in education, but not in college courses or credits.

In the meantime, in the search by institutions for new clienteles, reinforced by growing public interest in lifelong learning, the area of adult, continuing education and lifelong learning has become a kind of competitive battleground for bodies. Some institutions are reaching across the country for additional older students, and others are establishing off-campus operations practically within other institutions. There are few areas today where effective planning to meet the needs of citizens are more acute than in adult, continuing education and lifelong learning.

The second issue involves the fiscal situation. With recession and depression we already have experienced in many states a slowdown in the rate of increased funding in spite of inflation. In a few states there have been actual cutbacks. The fiscal situation is improving and the state income is increasing but there is little evidence that this will mean major increases in funding. Higher education no longer has the high priority it did in the 60s. Within higher education itself the student unrest of the late-60s and early-70s did not exactly inspire confidence. Recession and depression have increased state and taxpayer concern with frugality. Perhaps most important, the demands in other areas of public service -- health, welfare, energy and conservation -- have increased radically and state priorities have shifted to these. Finally, where state surpluses are building up again taxpayer relief has moved to the top of the priority list. Even within education, while elementary-secondary education has already gone through enrollment declines, public concern with return to the basics, minimal competency and school district equalization plus the increased costs to the states of federal programs, including the new handicapped legislation, has tended to give elementary-secondary education a higher priority than higher education. Remember that there is no requirement that young people go to college.

The third issue is the increased demand for accountability. This has and is taking at least three forms. The first is insistance upon more accurate, adequate and targeted information and the development of effective management information systems to supply it. The focus is not simply on quantity but on analysis, relevance and immediate availability.

The second form is what comes under the general rubric of performance audit. This includes not only fiscal audit but program audit -- that is,

concern with outcomes, educational results and effectiveness. Some 20 states have developed their own legislative or gubernatorial version of the federal General Accounting Office. While these usually have not been set up specifically with higher education in mind, higher education or some form of it tends to be an early target for unlike many other agencies higher education funds are not tied in most cases to mandatory formulas. This does raise critical questions about judgments of academic effectiveness, the criteria to be used, and institutional and system academic integrity. Since the demand will undoubtedly increase the issue is not whether it will be done but whether it will be done internally to higher education by the state higher education agency, in cooperation with institutions, or by an external agency with primary concern for efficiency rather than educational effectiveness. The one thing that seems clear is that if the institutions and the state agency, in other words, the academic community, do not assume this responsibility others are likely to do so (and in some cases already have).

The third form is increasing insistence on effective program review not only of new programs but of existing programs. The concern with and even demand for such program review is related to projected enrollments, the fiscal situation, presumed or actual duplication of programs and concern with maintaining quality in a period of retrenchment. As already noted, in a majority of states the state agency authorizing legislation calls for review and/or approval of new and existing programs. In the period of expansion such review tended to be limited primarily to new programs. Today both governmental pressure and institutional concern with maintaining quality in the face of retrenchment is making the issue progressively central. While continuous program review is or should be an

ongoing institutional function, in relation to diversification, role and scope and effective utilization of resources, it also is a matter of statewide concern.

A fourth issue is the growing state concern with other sectors of postsecondary education in addition to public higher education. While this was enhanced by the 1202 legislation even before 1972 some states were beginning to realize that one could not plan effectively for public higher education without taking the range of postsecondary education -- independent, proprietary and vocational institutions -- into account. All of these constitute important parts of the states' postsecondary educational resources. State concern with the independent sector in particular has become increasingly important. Not only is there concern that the independent sector needs to be included in the planning process but 43 states now make some form of direct or indirect aid available to them. Just what their continued role will be in the unsteady state, how the values they represent can be preserved without weakening the state's primary responsibility to public institutions, how destructive forms of competition can be avoided are major issues in a number of states.

A fifth issue is the impact of collective bargaining. What its full impact will be not only on individual campuses but on statewide coordinating and governing systems is not yet clear. While it is not yet a national phenomena it is becoming so. Not only has it affected intrainstitutional modes of operation but in some states, for example New York, it has led to negotiations not with local or system administrators but with the governor's office directly. What role collective bargaining will play in the unsteady state still is to be determined. Will it increase or inhibit

institutional flexibility in meeting changed conditions? Will it tend to reinforce greater centralization not necessarily through coordination and planning but through centralization of the bargaining process? What impact will it have when retrenchment, program review, and consolidation and performance audit come more fully into play?

A sixth factor is the growing impact of federal legislation and its regulations on statewide postsecondary educational activity. This is nothing new except in terms of scope. Three aspects call for mention. One is the increasing demand upon institutions and state agencies growing out of legislation not primarily aimed at higher education, such as civil rights, affirmative action, handicapped and occupational safety. These have statewide financial, planning and administrative as well as individual institutional implications. The second is specific demands upon institutions growing out of eligibility for federal funds such as prescribed information for students, financial disclosure and fiscal probity. The third is the range of federal programs that call for statewide plans and add new responsibilities for state agencies. These are not necessarily integrated on the federal level but somehow must be intergrated on the state level if we are not to end up with multiple and conflicting agencies on the state level reflecting multiple federal plans. These do require additional staff. It is critically important that state and federal programs be looked at and planned for in relation to each other.

A seventh factor which comes out of the other six, is concomitant with them, and to some extent also underlies them is what might be described more broadly as changing legislative and executive expectations. It is present in the fiscal situation and is exemplified in accountability and

particularly in concern with performance audit and program review. It might be considered a further elaboration of accountability or as a reaction to what has been perceived, whether correctly or not, as lack of accountability. It might also be described as a demand for greater responsibility through further centralization and control. It reflects a feeling that coordinating and even some governing boards are too weak or unwilling to exercise their responsibilities of keeping institutions in line, that institutions have not been willing to cooperate effectively with such boards and continue to engage in end runs, and that the only way that responsibility can be fixed and the hard realities of today dealt with is either by establishing a strong single governing board or a highly regulatory coordinating board that can control the system and make the hard decisions necessary. While this may seem an overly simplistic answer, not only is it a real alternative it is one that is appealing to many government officials and does seem to address some of the problems.

However, beyond this there is a further step or alternative. There is developing in some states a tendency to move responsibility for higher and postsecondary education decisions directly into the executive and/or legislative branches of state government. With the growth of executive and legislative staffs, where institutions do not work effectively with coordinating agencies and governing boards or where there is a concern that a single governing board would create a consolidated protagonist, it is always possible for executive and/or legislative branches of government to take over directly the major functions of budget review, audit control and decision making for higher and postsecondary education, and this appears to be happening in some states today.

These do not exhaust the issues by any means but they seem to be among the most persistent and pressing and are likely to grow in importance in the next few years. The basic question is where do we go from here? Are current boards adequate to deal with the new issues, with the problems of the unsteady state? What new roles can and should coordinating and governing boards play? How can or should they be strengthened? What are the alternatives? How do we preserve a degree of independence of institutions essential to imaginatively carrying out their functions? Are we inevitably heading towards ever greater centralization and regulation?

My crystal ball is as clouded as the next persons, but it seems to me that some things are rather clear. The first is that return to no coordination or to wholly voluntary coordination are not real alternatives. Further, I strongly suspect that the days of purely advisory coordination, Clark Kerr to the contrary, are limited. Given the nature of the issues, the increasing competition for students, and the necessity at some points for hard decisions, boards without some implementing powers in addition to persuasion are likely as are the institutions under their purview to be in serious trouble.

Second, it is not possible or desirable to try to speculate on what the best or most feasible form of coordination in all the states should be. Again, each of the states is different. The seriousness of the issues vary from state to state and take somewhat different forms in each state. In a very few states even enrollments are not a serious problem. The forms of coordination will and should vary with the needs, conditions and histories of the states. Some boards have been far more effective in their

states than others have been in theirs. In terms of adequacy of present boards some undoubtedly will have to be strengthened. Some states will in all likelihood move to consolidated governing boards. But how far and in which direction they move will have to be determined in the individual states.

Third, it does seem rather clear at this point, that preserving or enhancing institutional independence to operate effectively, within role and scope and in the face of increased demands for accountability and outcomes, depends far more directly than ever before upon institutional support for and involvement in statewide planning and coordination. The alternative is not return to institutional laissez-faire but direct political intervention.

Having stressed the uniqueness of solutions to particular states, there are, however, certain responsibilities and activities that institutions and coordinating or governing boards are going to need to consider as far more urgent and critical than in the past. Among these would seem to be the following:

The first is to recognize that statewide planning is even more essential today than in the period of expansion but that its emphasis has and must shift in most states to the more difficult task of planning for steady or decreasing enrollments and retrenchment.

The second is to recognize that the total postsecondary educational resources of the state must be taken into account in the planning process -- public, private and proprietary -- and that no system can or should be penalized at the expense of the others if resources are to be utilized effectively to meet the educational needs of students.

Third, far more attention will have to be given to relating expenditures to outcomes, to performance audit.

Fourth, the nature of the budgeting process will need to be thoroughly reviewed and formulas reexamined in terms of their adequacy to deal with problems of contraction.

Fifth, while it is not the function of coordinating or governing boards or institutions to set other state priorities, such agencies should not only be aware of these other priorities but of the ways in which these relate to higher education.

Sixth, of particular importance now is attention to statewide and even regional planning for adult, continuing education and lifelong learning.

Finally, and fundamentally, it is of basic importance that the lines of communication between coordinating and/or governing boards not only with institutions but with legislative and executive branches of state government be kept open. Recognizing the importance of this is not to politicize higher or postsecondary education but to enable legislators, governors, state higher or postsecondary education agencies and institutions to work more effectively with each other to meet the critical problems ahead. Only if this occurs can the confidence essential to effective operations be built.

Statewide coordination and/or governance is here to stay. The problems and issues will make the period ahead less than easy for institutions, state coordinating or governing agencies, and for state government related to postsecondary education. State boards and agencies must have both the powers and the resources including staff to carry out their functions

effectively. They will need the support and cooperation of the institutions under their purview. The stakes in their effectiveness and success for institutions, for higher education, for students and for the future of education in this country are extraordinarily high. This is a time for non-parochial leadership and cooperation. The alternatives may well be either the politicization of higher education or the development of something much closer to ministries of education under which the tradition of institutional independence may all but disappear.

RMM:mb

Speech prepared by Dr. Richard M. Millard, Director of Postsecondary Education at the Education Commission of the States for the Seminar on Statewide Coordination and Governance of Postsecondary Education: Quality, Costs and Accountability -- the Major Issues of the '80s, cosponsored by the Inservice Education Program of the Education Commission of the States and the Spring Hill Center on December 11-13, 1977 at Spring Hill Center in Wayzata, Minnesota.